



CHEMONICS INTERNATIONAL INC.

**Electronic Document Submission Title Page**

Contract No.:	278-C-00-02-00210-00
Contractor Name:	Chemonics International, Inc.
USAID Cognizant Technical Office:	Office of Economic Opportunities USAID Jordan
Date of Product/Report:	28 February 2005
Document Title:	COE Shared Constraints Follow-Through Processes: COE-Processes Report  FINAL
Author's Name:	Amal Awwad/Al-Jidara
Activity Title and Number:	Achievement of Market-Friendly Initiatives and Results Program (AMIR 2.0 Program)  PSPI 587.05 COE Shared Constraints Follow-Through Processes
Name and Version of Application Software Used to Create the File:	<i>MS Word 2002</i>
Format of Graphic and/or Image File:	<i>N/A</i>
Other Information:	<i>WinZip Windows</i>

Contract No.:	278-C-00-02-00210-00
Contractor Name:	Chemonics International, Inc.
USAID Cognizant Technical Office:	Office of Economic Opportunities USAID/Jordan
Date of Report:	28 February 2005
Document Title: Processes:	COE Shared Constraints Follow-Through  COE-Processes Report Final Report
Author's Name:	Amal Awwad/Al-Jidara
Activity Title and Number:	Achievement of Market-Friendly Initiatives and Results Program (AMIR 2.0 Program) PSPI Component, 'COE Shared Constraints Follow-Through Processes', Task No. 587.05

**Centers of Excellence Shared Constraints  
Follow-Through Processes:  
Centers of Excellence Processes Report**

Final Report  
28 February 2005

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

## **Data Page**

Name of Component:	PSPI
Author:	Amal Awwad/Al-Jidara
Practice Area:	Democracy and Governance
Service Offering:	N/A
List of Key Words Contained in Report:	Centers of Excellence (COE), Processes, Telecommunication Regulatory Commission (TRC), Ministry of Information and Communications Technology (MOICT), Jordan Economic Development Corporation (JEDCO), Jordan Investment Board (JIB), Jordan Institution of Standards and Metrology (JISM), Ministry of Planning (MOP), Quality Management System (QMS)

## **Abstract**

This report provides an overview of the services provided under the Center of Excellence (COE) Shared Constraints Follow-Through Processes scope of work. It describes the services extended to each COE partner process team, highlighting the achievements undertaken by each, and provides recommendations to further assist these organizations to achieve the COE status in the area of processes.

## **Abbreviations and Acronyms**

COE	Center of Excellence
JEDCO	Jordan Economic Development Corporation
JIB	Jordan Investment Board
JISM	Jordan Institution of Standards and Metrology
MIT	Ministry of Industry and Trade
MOICT	Ministry of Information and Communications Technology
MOP	Ministry of Planning
QMS	Quality Management System
TRC	Telecommunication Regulatory Commission

## Table of Contents

UT1 Executive Summary .....	1
UT2 JEDCO .....	2
UT3 MOICT.....	3
UT4 MIT .....	4
UT5 TRC.....	5
UT6 Customs.....	6
UT7 MOP .....	7
UT8 Annex- Previous Deliverables .....	8

## Executive Summary

The objective of this consultancy was to provide technical assistance addressing the highest shared priority of the Center of Excellence (COE) Processes forum: Train and coach COE partner institution process teams on process analysis and improvement methodologies. The project capitalized on earlier work performed by the USAID-funded AMIR Program to achieve international best practices for government in the process area covered by the COE criteria, and to build on the knowledge and experience that was gained by the COE Partners in that regard.

The services provided focused on:

1. Providing training workshops to cover the fundamentals of process evaluation and improvement.
2. Providing assistance as requested by the COE partners on specific procedural Improvements, objectives, and methodologies, and on developing action plans for process improvement reforms.
3. Providing best- practices and case studies based on each organization's needs.

The COE partners were encouraged to utilize the service provided through introductory meetings conducted with each organization process champion and also through emails aimed at introducing the service. The organizations varied in their achievements of the COE process requirements, and in their needs and willingness to utilize the service provided. Due to the type of the service provided that depended mostly on the COE partners' proactivity and willingness to conduct the work themselves, minor achievements can be considered.

At the very early stage, the Jordan Investment Board (JIB) chose to withdraw and the Jordan Institute for Standards and Metrology (JISM) was not interested in the one-to-one service but attended the final workshop. Others like the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIT) did not show interest and chose not to utilize the service provided, nor to attend the workshop.

Organizations like Telecommunications and Regulatory Commission (TRC), Ministry of Information and Communications Technology (MOICT) and Ministry of Planning (MOP) had on-going efforts to achieve the COE process requirements either by in-house or an outsourced consultant. These organizations were specific in the way they intended to benefit from the service provided- either by understanding certain topics through workshops such as TRC, by receiving documentation of the tools, methodologies and best practice like MOICT, or by assessing their achievements in that regard like MOP. Other organizations like the Jordan Export Development Corporation (JEDCO) and Customs were willing to gain the knowledge but not willing to implement.

Finally, most of the COE partners process teams attended a training workshop in which all the fundamentals of process evaluation and improvement were covered in details. Tools, templates, case studies and reference materials were provided through this workshop.

The following sections provide a more detailed description of each organization's participation and achievements, in addition; Annex –I provides a list of all reference materials and presentations provided to COE partners

## **1 JEDCO**

JEDCO had a very low team morale, hence commitment, due to the organization's recent transformation into a public sector entity. In general, this attitude created instability in the overall work environment. Management had little buy-in for the COE Program, and provided little support for process improvement efforts.

Based on the early assessment, the main functions of JEDCO functions were not properly identified, the governance of the organization was centralized at top management, and communication channels were not well defined. In addition, processes lacked proper documentation if they existed at all, no process performance measures were established, and the in-house process team that was previously formulated was not activated.

### **1.1 Activities Performed**

1. COE process criterion was reiterated and explained to the process team in details. This included the internal auditing process, employees and customer feedback process, process revision and streamlining tools.
2. Methodology documentation, explaining a step-by-step implementation approach along with deliverables required from the process team, was provided.
3. A sample working plan was provided to the process team. The plan suggested two pilot projects:
  - a. An organizational process documentation project
  - b. A streamlining project for selected procedures to focus on: quick wins, customer added value and management visibility.
4. Proposed procedures templates were shared and discussed with the team.
5. Follow up meetings were held to provide explanation, answer internal team inquiries and follow-up progress.
6. The consultant encouraged the team to involve the rest of the staff in the documentation project, to accelerate the process, under team supervision.

### **1.2 Achievements:**

1. JEDCO launched a process documentation project to form a base for the organizational operation and for future efforts to streamline their procedures.
2. Organization's main functions and procedures were identified.
3. JEDCO process team gained the required knowledge and was provided with the tools required to achieve the process criterion requirements. However, due to the organization situation, management style, and low team morale and willingness, minimal achievements were noticed.

### **1.3 Recommendations**

JEDCO is in need of external support and on-going consultation to achieve the COE status in processes criterion. This effort is recommended when the organization reaches a stable direction whether being a public or private sector entity. The approach of management and internal communications need to be revamped for such effort to succeed.



## **2 MOICT**

MOICT has the management buy-in and support for the COE concept and willingness to achieve its award. The process champion of this ministry had already drafted a framework and action plan to achieve COE status; however, the plan was not implemented. Overall, MOICT has a good repository of defined procedures that once revised, can be put into implementation.

Generally, the availability and dedication of the team is considered an obstacle to implementing its action plan. The process team is not officially formulated and not all team members are aware of their assignments.

### **2.1 Support provided**

1. The action plan was reviewed and MOICT was advised to pilot the second phase for selected departments of their action plan, assessment and achieving the COE status on the process level.
2. Methodology documentation, explaining a step-by-step implementation approach along with deliverables required from the process team, was provided.
3. Comprehensive packages covering the techniques of customer added value, performance indicators and change management, process mapping templates, tools and techniques and detailed description of the process improvement tools were delivered to MOICT based on their request.

### **2.2 Achievements**

1. MOICT chose not to start tackling the COE requirements until gap analysis for the MOICT Quality Management System (QMS), and the sponsorship of the AMIR Program, is completed.
2. MOICT was given best practices, tools and techniques in packages so they can refer to them when needed.

### **2.3 Recommendations**

MOICT needs to either dedicate the process champion or outsource to an external consultant to archive the COE status.

### **3 MIT**

MIT has an established Quality Management System, ISO-certified, which focuses on customer related procedures. Hence, MIT was able to have a Procedures Manual and Internal Auditing Manual. However, internal procedures are not documented. Process improvement and streaming activities are carried out by the commercial department.

It was found that improvement efforts are not institutionalized and are based on individual efforts; hence these were not linked to other departments within the organization. MIT did not formulate a process team, as there is little management buy-in to the COE concept which is not considered a priority. There have been frequent changes in the top management, which affected the CEO implementation.

#### **3.1 Support provided**

1. An introductory meeting was conducted with the process champion, in which the consultant services were offered to assist the organization in their effort to achieve the COE status in process criterion.

#### **3.2 Achievements**

1. No constructive activities were performed as part of this assignment since MIT does not consider the project as high on its priority list and the assigned process champion did not provide commitment or interest.

#### **3.3 Recommendations**

Alignment with senior management needs to be established on the importance of achieving the COE status prior to starting further projects.

## **4 TRC**

TRC had already started to establish their Quality Management System that would include their operation procedures. The Process Team was formulated and trained on the process mapping techniques and oriented on the COE process criterion. Key processes were defined and a plan to achieve COE processes requirements was set.

The Process Champion, previously a process consultant, is fully dedicated to lead TRC towards achieving the COE status in processes. Based on the initial assessment, TRC has identified that key performance indicators, change management and customer added value as topics they need more training on.

### **4.1 Support provided**

1. A specially designed two-day workshop, attended by the process champion, process team and members of each department, was conducted. The workshop covered the requested topics and their implementation methodology.
2. Best practices regarding the requested topics was delivered to TRC

### **4.2 Achievements**

TRC has the sufficient background, best practices and tools for: change management, customer added value and performance indicators that should help the process team to comply with the 3<sup>rd</sup> criterion in the COE processes.

### **4.3 Recommendation**

If further support is requested, it should be provided to TRC as they showed high commitment and understanding to be ready for COE evaluation.

## 5 Customs

Customs has their Central Branch processes documented and are extending their efforts to include the other branches. Customs has two departments in addition to the process team working on process related aspects:

1. Internal Auditing Department, responsible for auditing existing procedures.
2. Procedural Division, responsible for controlling the process improvement efforts.

Both Process Team and Procedural Department lack management support and by passed for any process improvement efforts. Chaotic process changes that are not well analyzed are mostly not channeled through to the right divisions. These efforts were not lead or controlled by any process related teams; hence, a lot of redundant work and non-structured implementation were noticed. Most importantly, the formulated process team did not show harmony.

### 5.1 Support provided

1. COE process requirements were explained in detail to the process team.
2. It was recommended to start with documenting and standardizing the branches' common processes through questionnaire based data gathering approach.
3. Customs were encouraged to utilize the results of the internal auditing as a process improvement source. Proper Internal Auditing and Process Improvement best practices were explained to the team.
4. Customs were encouraged to involve the internal auditing department head, and the procedural department head with the process team for better synergy and alignment.
5. The Process Champion was encouraged to formulate an action plan to achieve the process COE status.
6. Due to the complexity of the carried on processes within customs that requires various pre-approvals and many stakeholders, customs were encouraged to adapt a “One Stop Shop” concept to streamline their processes. This would require enhancing the relation with the external stakeholders, assessing the legal aspect of each step and introducing different communication channels.

### 5.2 Achievements

The process criterion requirement, internal auditing and process improvement cycles were explained to customs. Customs resisted putting an action plan to the effort, and hence no progress has taken place.

### 5.3 Recommendations

The current situation is discouraging for traders and investors as they are forced to deal with the customs current processes. Customs requires a well-thought BPR for processes that requires various pre-approvals and involves many stakeholders specially those that carry financial costs on importers and exporters. Business process reengineering needs to be performed by an external management consultant as the internal staff does not have the capacity or the required knowledge to perform this task. The customs team requires some considerable capacity building and training to align with the COE efforts.

## **6 MOP**

MOP has worked, with the help of an external consultant, on business process improvement and documentation project. Most of the COE process requirements for process modeling and streamlining were covered. The new system was pending top management approval

### **6.1 Support provided**

1. Sample of the performed work was reviewed. A diagnostic report identifying what else needs to be done to complete the COE process requirements was provided based on this review.
2. Methodology documentation, explaining a step-by-step implementation approach along with deliverables required from the process team, was provided.
3. MOP was encouraged to put the system into implementation and expand on it to cover other requirements of the COE processes that were identified in the assessment. These are key performance indicators and measurement process, customer identification, channels of communication and feedback assessment.

### **6.2 Achievement**

1. MOP chose not to utilize the consultant services beyond the consultant's review of sample document.
2. MOP asked consultant to prepare a presentation to help explain the project scope and objectives to top management

### **6.3 Recommendations**

Further follow-up with MOP is required to investigate their needs in order to support their efforts towards COE.

## **7 Annex: List of Previous Deliverables**

### **7.1 PROCESS WORKSHOP**

1. PROCESS WORKSHOP -PRESENTATION
2. HANDOUTS
  - EXERCISE 1- CHANGE MANAGEMENT
  - SAMPLE ANSWERS EXERCISE 1- CHANGE MANAGEMENT
  - EXERCISE 2 -KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - SAMPLE ANSWERS EXERCISE 2 - KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - HANDOUT 1- ADOPTERS STAGES
  - HANDOUT 2- FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS
  - HANDOUT 3- REASONS FOR RESISTING CHANGE
  - HANDOUT 4- TACTICS OF DEALING WITH RESISTANCE
  - HANDOUT 5- IMPLEMENTING AN EFFECTIVE CHANGE PROGRAM
  - HANDOUT 6- HELICOPTER VIEW OF PROCESSES
  - HANDOUT 7- KEY PROCESS SELECTION MATRIX
  - HANDOUT 8- SAMPLE PROCEDURE TEMPLATE 1
  - HANDOUT 8- SAMPLE PROCEDURE TEMPLATE 2
  - HANDOUT 9 -DATA GATHERING GUIDELINES
  - HANDOUT10 - SIMPLE FLOWCHARTING GUIDELINES
  - HANDOUT 11-SAMPLE FLOWCHARTS
  - HANDOUT 12- SAMPLE FLOWCHART TEMPLATE
  - HANDOUT 13 - INTERNAL QUALITY AUDITING
  - HANDOUT 14 - MANAGEMENT REVIEW
  - HANDOUT 15 - CORRECTIVE AND PREVENTIVE ACTION
  - HANDOUT 16-THE PRACTICE OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - HANDOUT 17 -KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS-BSC
  - HANDOUT 18- ANALYSIS SHEET TEMPLATE
  - HANDOUT 19 -SETTING UP A CUSTOMER SERVICE PROGRAM
  - HANDOUT 20- ACTION PLAN
  - HANDOUT21- PORCESS PROCEDURES DEFINITIONS
  - HANDOUT22- GOLSSARY-ISO 9000 2000 DEFINITIONS
  - HANDOUT23- SAMPLE WORK INSTRUCTIONS
3. CASE STUDY
  - SAMPLE AS IS- PROCEDURE
  - SAMPLE AS IS –FLOWCHARTING
  - SAMPLE TO BE
  - SAMPLE PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS

### **7.2 JEDCO**

4. PROCESSES CRITERION - PROPOSED METHODOLOGY
5. JEDCO MS. PROJECT PLAN
6. PROCEDURE DATA GATHERING TEMPLATE
7. PROCEDURE FLOWCHART TEMPLATE

### **7.3 MOICT**

#### **PACKAGE 1- PROCESS IMPROVEMENT AND MAPPING**

1. BUSINESS PROCESS IMPROVEMENT- PROJECT GUIDE
2. BUSINESS PROCESS REDESIGN- AN OVERVIEW
3. ANALYSIS SHEET
4. DATA GATHERING

- DATA GATHERING GUIDELINES
  - DATA GATHERING TEMPLATES
  - 5. PROCESS FLOWCHARTING
  - FLOWCHARTS- SAMPLES
  - SIMPLE FLOWCHARTING- GUIDELINES
  - 6. TOOLS
  - HELICOPTER VIEW OF PROCESSES
  - KEY PROCESS SELECTION MATRIX
  - PROCESS MAPPING AT ACTIVITY LEVEL
  - 7. PROCESS IMPROVEMENT TOOLS
  - AFFINITY DIAGRAM
  - DECISION MAKING TOOLS
  - OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS
  - BRAINSTORMING SESSION
  - FLOWCHART
  - THE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT NOTEBOOK FORMS POCKET
- PACKAGE 2- CHANGE MANAGEMENT
- 1. ADOPTERS STAGES
  - 2. CHANGE MANAGEMENT- A BROADER VIEW
  - 3. CHANGE MANAGEMENT- PROCESS FOCUS
  - 4. FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS
  - 5. REASONS FOR RESISTING CHANGE
  - 6. TACTICS OF DEALING WITH RESISTANCE
- PACKAGE 3- KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
- 1. COE- PERFORMANCE INDICATORS- PRESENTATION
  - 2. KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS- BALANCE SCORECARD
  - 3. PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
  - 4. THE PRACTICE OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - 5. TOOLS
  - CONTROL CHART
  - DATA COLLECTION
  - RUN CHART
- PACKAGE 4- CUSTOMER ADDED VALUE
- 1. COE- CUSTOMER ADDED VALUE
  - 2. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION
  - 3. SETTING UP A CUSTOMER SERVICE PROGRAM

## **7.4 TRC**

- 1. COE - CHANGE MANAGEMENT - PRESENTATION  
CHANGE MANAGEMENT HANDOUTS:
  - EXERCISE1-CHANGE MANAGEMENT
  - HANDOUT1 - CHANGE MANAGEMENT- PROCESS FOCUS
  - HANDOUT2 - CHANGE MANAGEMENT- A BROADER VIEW
  - HANDOUT3 - CHANGE RESISTANCE
  - HANDOUT4 - IMPLEMENTING AN EFFECTIVE CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM – CHECKLIST
- 2. COE - PERFORMANCE INDICATORS – PRESENTATION  
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS HANDOUTS:
  - EXERCISE1-KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - EXERCISE 2 - KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - SAMPLE ANSWERS EXERCISE 2 - KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - HANDOUT1 -KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS
  - HANDOUT2 -KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

3. COE- CUSTOMER ADDED VALUE- PRESENTATION

CUSTOMER ADDED VALUE HANDOUTS:

- HANDOUT1 -CUSTOMER ADDED VALUE

## **7.5 MOP**

2. PROCESSES CRITERION - PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

3. MOP DIAGNOSTIC REPORT

4. BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING- BEST PRACTICES

5. FLOWCHARTING- GUIDELINES

6. MOP PROCESS PRESENTATION- PREPARED BUT NOT DELIVERED